

Ok within a range of about 1° to about 89° with respect to a remaining portion of the plurality of blades.

77. (Once Amended) The device of claim 30 further including [wherein the anchor is] a prong.

REMARKS

Amendments have been made to the two independent claims 6 and 30. These claims now include language which discloses an adhesive as the anchoring means. Dependent claims therefrom have been amended to provide claims which are consistent with the changes made to claims 6 and 30.

There is support in the specification on page 15, lines 5-17 for the amendments made to claims 6 and 30. Applicants assert that claims 6 and 30 are novel and non-obvious over of the cited prior art. As all other claims depend from either claim 6 or 30, all claims are now in condition for allowance.

Though not needed for support of the above assertion by the Applicant that the claims are in condition for allowance, Applicant makes the following arguments for the record in regard to various rejections made by the examiner.

The examiner has asserted on page 2, paragraph 2, of the Office Action that Ganderton , USPN3,814,097, discloses that "puncturing inherently results in conically extending through hole surrounded by an uneven row of triangular shaped projections."

There is no discussion in Ganderton describing the shape of the projections or that the through hole is conically shaped. Further there is no discussion as to how many projections are around the hole.

The examiners assertion that the hole is "surrounded" by projections is contradicted by the disclosure in Ganderton, Example 5, Column 8, lines 58 and 59. In that example, Ganderton discloses that the result of the punching process results in "a burr 104 μ m in length". The result is a single burr, of some undefined shape and not a row of projections surrounding the hole.

Further, a "conically extending through hole" is not the inherently result of a punching process. Punches can be hollow with sharpened edges which would result in a straight sided hole, with few if any barbs or projections formed. If one is referring to partially bent projections forming a conically opening, that would only result if the punch were not driven entirely through the sheet. Again, partially bent projections or conically shaped holes do not of necessity result from a punching process and thus these features cannot be said to be the inherent result of a punching operation.

Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejection over Ganderton be withdrawn.

Reed, USPN 5,312,456, describes a series of interlocking barbs. However all the embodiments of Reed are mushroom or umbrella shaped as shown by the top view in figure 4 and the perspective view in figure 7. These embodiments do not anticipate the claims in the present invention which disclose blades. Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejection over Reed be withdrawn.

Rejection over § 103

The examiner has rejected a number of the claims based upon § 103 obviousness over Ganderton or Reed, individually. Therefore as both Ganderton and Reed fail to disclose significant features to the invention, as previously discussed, they cannot each by themselves form the basis for a § 103 rejection, even when combined with art known in the field. Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections be withdrawn.

Applicant asserts that the claims are now in condition for allowance, notice of which is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Owen J. Bates
Owen J. Bates
Registration No. 40,346

ALZA Corporation
1900 Charleston Road
(P.O. Box 7219
Palo Alto, CA 94039-7210
Telephone: (650) 564-7867 Fax: (650) 564-2195

*called on
1/3/00 to
inform*